

**HPA RFP #090105**

# **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

***FOR THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF A  
COMPREHENSIVE AND INTEGRATED ON-STREET  
PARKING AND CITATION MANAGEMENT  
INFORMATION SYSTEM***

**HARTFORD PARKING AUTHORITY  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT**

**September 2005**

## **Table of Contents**

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Intent and General Information.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Proposal Format.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Purpose and Background.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Scope of Services.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Systems Performance and Security Requirements.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Proposer’s Tasks.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Compensation to the Successful Proposer.....</b>	<b>34</b>
	<b>2001 Parking Operational Review.....</b>	<b>Appendix A</b>
	<b>Proposer Experience Matrix.....</b>	<b>Appendix B</b>
	<b>Compliance Matrix.....</b>	<b>Appendix C</b>
	<b>Compensation Bid Form.....</b>	<b>Schedule A</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Hartford currently manages and operates the on-street parking system using four entities. This includes the Police Department, Department of Public Works, the Department of Licenses and Inspections and the Tax Collector's Office. The responsibility to manage and operate the on-street parking program has now been delegated to the Hartford Parking Authority. It is the intent of the Parking Authority to fully privatize the management of the on-street parking program under a management contract for a term of 5 years. This includes all aspects of management and operation of the program with the exception of the magistrate that would be the final recourse to adjudicate parking violations.

A March 2001 report (Exhibit A) is contained herein to provide historic perspective into the enforcement/ticket collection effort. Since that March 2001 report some positive changes have taken place in the collection of outstanding parking violations. An outside contractor was hired in May of 2004 to clear a 6-8 month backlog of tickets that were not entered for collection. As a result of this collection effort, FY 2005 ticket revenues rose by \$800,000 over the previous year. FY 2004 ticket revenues were approximately \$1.2 million dollars while FY 2005 revenues approached \$2 million.

It is the intent of the Hartford Parking Authority (the Authority or HPA) to select a firm that has the necessary background qualifications, and experience in managing all aspects of privatization to oversee, manage, and operate the on-street parking program in a first class manner. The primary goal is to bring about compliance with on-street parking regulations. The responsibilities of the privatized management and operations effort include but are not limited to the following:

1. Providing well-trained, uniformed, and fully equipped enforcement staff that includes electronic handheld ticket writers and any and all communication or other devices deemed necessary to perform parking violation enforcement responsibilities
2. Issuing parking violations in the central business district and other areas throughout the City
3. Complying with City of Hartford, CT living wage requirements for all personnel associated with the privatized management of the on-street parking program
4. Collecting coins from parking meters in a timely and organized manner
5. Maintaining parking meters in peak mechanical condition
6. Auditing parking meters using available software and "salting" meters on an occasional basis
7. Maintaining and replacing/repairing signage governing parking posted on-street and signage located on parking meters
8. Straightening Painting all parking meter polls within 4 months of

- entering into a contract with the HPA
9. Re-keying all parking meters with a state-of-the-art locking system (Lori Lock, Abloy Lock or equal) within 60 days of commencement of Work that is contemplated under this RFP
  10. Providing bid-ready specifications to the HPA for Pay-And-Display central parking meters that accept credit cards within 6 months of commencement of Work associated with this RFP.
  11. Overseeing the HPA bid by acting as Owners Agent associated with the aforementioned procurement of Pay-And-Display central parking meters that accept credit cards
  12. Overseeing and completing the installation of Pay-And-Display central parking meters that accept credit cards.
  13. Recommending changes to enforcement zones within 12 months of commencement of Work associated with this RFP.
  14. Sending dunning notices for parking violations and vigorously pursuing collection of outstanding parking violations income due the City
  15. Providing all necessary data processing, computer systems, software, and personnel associated with the collection effort
  16. Providing monthly and ad hoc reports to the Authority and to the Tax Collector's Office
  17. Communicating with the Connecticut Division of Motor Vehicles to provide notice of failure to receive payment for outstanding parking violations
  18. Providing an appeals process for parking violations
  19. Responding to citizen inquiries/complaints
  20. Providing a terminal for the Magistrate's office or hearing room to enter dispositions.
  21. Provide easily accessible and bi-lingual opportunities for citizens to pay tickets, via the web, remote kiosks/drop boxes and a staffed office.

## **1.0 Intent and General Information**

This Request for Proposals ("RFP") is being issued by the HPA to solicit proposals from qualified firms for the provision and ongoing operation, maintenance and performance of a Comprehensive and Integrated On-Street Parking and Citation Management Information System (PCMIS) for the HPA. This RFP contains the required information needed by prospective Proposers for submission of proposals. The RFP will be conducted according to the Purchasing Rules and Regulations of the HPA.

### **1.1 RFP Administrator**

The person responsible for administering this RFP is: James J. Kopencey, Executive Director of the HPA. No later than November 4, 2005 prior to opening, all questions, correspondence, and inquiries should be addressed to Mr. Kopencey in writing at the Hartford Parking Authority, 155 Morgan Street, Hartford, CT 06103 or via e-mail at [kopej001@hartford.gov](mailto:kopej001@hartford.gov)

Responses to verbal questions posed at the pre-bid conference will be answered at that time unless the response requires investigation. If investigation is required, questions raised at the pre-bid conference and questions raised after the pre-bid conference will be responded to in writing and provided to all Proposers by USPS mail.

## **1.2 Mandatory Pre-Bid Meeting**

A mandatory pre-bid meeting will be held for all prospective Proposers on Friday, October 14, 2005 at 1:00 PM at 155 Morgan Street, Hartford, CT 06103.

Requests for interpretations and explanations to specifics in the RFP are encouraged before the Pre-Bid Conference. **These questions shall be received in written form by the HPA, no later than October 12, 2005 2 days prior to the Pre-Proposal Conference.** Questions from the floor will also be accepted at the Pre-Bid Conference. A transcript of all responses to both the written questions and questions asked at the Pre-Bid Conference will be sent to Proposers in the form of addendums as clarification to the RFP. Any verbal explanations of instructions will not be binding on the HPA. No further questions will be accepted after November 8, 2005.

Attendance at the Pre-Proposal Conference is **MANDATORY**. Prior to the Pre-Proposal conference, submit questions to:

Mr. James J. Kopencey  
Executive Director  
Hartford Parking Authority  
155 Morgan Street  
Hartford, CT 06103  
(860) 549-7275 Fax  
Email [kopej001@hartford.gov](mailto:kopej001@hartford.gov)

## **1.3 Submission Deadline**

**The proposal submission deadline is Monday, November 14, 2005 no later than 3:30 PM eastern time.**

All Proposals must be submitted to (also, please note following section 1.6 and 1.7):

James J. Kopencey  
Executive Director  
Hartford Parking Authority  
155 Morgan Street  
Hartford, CT 06103

The HPA reserves the right to request additional information from Proposers, to

waive any informality in the proposals, and to reject any and all proposals if deemed by the HPA to be in the best interest of the HPA. The HPA will not be responsible for any costs incurred in the preparation of responses to this RFP or for additional information that the HPA may request the Proposer to provide.

#### **1.4 Contract Period**

The Successful Proposer (“SP”) will enter into a five (5) year contract with the HPA, and that term may not be extended.

#### **1.5 Implementation Date**

The implementation date shall commence sixty (60) days after the execution of a Contract between the HPA and the SP. It is imperative that the new System be ***fully tested and online*** by this date. The thoroughness and ability of the Proposer’s implementation plan to achieve this deadline will be weighted considerably by the selection committee.

#### **1.6 Principals/Collusion**

By submission of a proposal, the Proposer does declare that the only person or persons interested in this proposal as principal or principals is/or, are named therein and that no other person other than the therein mentioned party has any interest in this proposal or contract to be entered into; that this proposal is made without connection with any person, company or parties making a proposal, and that it is in all respects fair and in good faith without collusion or fraud.

#### **1.7 Packaging**

The original proposal (including the original Special Attachments) shall be placed in **one sealed envelope**, bearing the name and address of the Proposer and clearly marked with the words “***HPA RFP #090105: (Comprehensive and Integrated On-street Parking and Citation Management Information System)***”. Ten (10) copies of the original shall be placed in a separate sealed envelope or box, bearing the name and address of the Proposer and clearly marked with the words “***HPA RFP #090105 Comprehensive and Integrated On-Street Parking and Citation Management Information System)***”

#### **1.8 Insurance**

The SP shall be required to furnish proof of the following insurance coverage within ten (10) days of receipt of Notice of Selection. Insurance shall be issued by an insurance company licensed to conduct business in the State of Connecticut with a Best’s Key Rating of A- or better. Any and all exceptions must be approved by the City of Hartford’s Risk Manager. Insurance coverage shall

remain in full force for the duration of the Contract term. Each insurance certificate shall contain a thirty (30) day notice of cancellation. All renewal certificates shall be furnished at least thirty (30) days prior to policy expiration.

**1.8.1 Commercial General Liability**, including Contractual Liability Insurance, with limits not less than \$2,000,000 Combined Single Limit Bodily Injury and Property Damage. All, if any, deductibles are the sole responsibility of the selected SP to pay and/or indemnify.

**1.8.2 Workers' Compensation** in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes.

**1.8.3 Maintain a \$5,000,000 Commercial Umbrella Policy** for the duration of the Contract.

**1.8.4 Employer's Liability:**

\$100,000 bodily injury for each accident;  
\$100,000 bodily injury by disease for each employee  
\$500,000 bodily injury by disease aggregate

**1.8.5 Professional Liability**

Professional Liability coverage shall be issued on a claim made basis with \$2,000,000 Single Limit for the term of the contract and for two years following its completion.

**1.8.6 The City of Hartford and HPA are included as an Additional Insureds, ATIMA** under the Commercial General Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance Policies.

**1.8.7** All insurance coverage named above shall provide not less than a thirty (30) day notice of cancellation to the HPA. All policies shall be on the occurrence form. Any and all exceptions shall be reviewed by the City's Risk Manager.

**1.8.8** It is further agreed that the amount of insurance required herein does not, in any way, limit the liability of the SP by virtue of its promise to hold City and HPA harmless so that in the event that any claims result in a settlement or judgment in any amount above the limits set in Paragraph 1.7.1 herein, the SP shall be liable to, or for the benefit of, the City and HPA for the excess.

**1.8.9** Insurance requirements and coverage may be reviewed from time to time during the term of this Contract and all extensions and renewals hereof. The SP agrees to comply with any and all reasonable insurance requirements or modifications made by the City's Risk Manager.

**1.8.10** Cancellation or other termination of insurance policies required by this Section without immediate replacement thereof may be considered a default in the terms and conditions of this Agreement. The SP agrees that such default may be cured by procurement of insurance on behalf of SP, at the SP's expense.

**1.8.11** SP shall be responsible for all deductibles and reimbursements.

## **1.9 Hold Harmless Agreement**

In addition to its obligation to provide insurance as specified above, the SP, its agents and assigns shall indemnify and hold harmless the HPA and the City, including but not limited to, its elected officials, its officers and agents ("the City") from any and all claims made against the City or HPA, including but not limited to, damages, awards, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees, to the extent any such claim directly and proximately results from the wrongful, willful or negligent performance of services by the SP during the SP's performance of this Contract or any other Contract of the SP entered into by reason thereof. The HPA and the City agrees to give the SP prompt notice of any such claim and absent a conflict of interest, an opportunity to control the defense thereof.

## **1.10 Conditions**

Proposers responding to this RFP will be expected to adhere to the following conditions and make a positive statement to that effect in its proposal submitted:

**1.10.1** Have personnel/resource reserves sufficient to assure task continuity.

**1.10.2** Agree that all subcontractors hired by the Proposer must have prior written approval of the HPA.

**1.10.3** Agree to give first consideration to Hartford residents, for employment positions, which have furnished proper proof of residency.

**1.10.4** The Firm shall comply with and is subject to the City of



Harford Living Wage Ordinance as set forth in Sec. 2-761 et. Seq. of the Municipal Code. An information sheet regarding this ordinance is enclosed herein for reference.

The firm shall comply with and is subject to Sec. 2-545 of the Municipal Code as it relates to Equal Employment Opportunity Employment. A copy of said code section is enclosed herein for reference.

The firm shall complete and submit a “BIDDER’S EEO REPORT” form (see 2.1.13)

**1.10.5** Agree to allow for an audit at any time by either the City's or HPA's Internal Audit Department or a designated accounting or Audit firm of any and all accounts and operations of the SP as they relate to the City and HPA.

**1.10.6** Agree that the resultant Contract may be terminated in the event of non-appropriation of funds.

**1.10.7** Agree to accept and follow management direction from the HPA and specifically, the HPA’s designated personnel.

**1.10.8** Agree to conform to all applicable laws, rules, regulations and ordinances and statutes of the Federal Government, State of Connecticut and City of Hartford, including but not limited to the following:

1. Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended
2. Civil Rights Act of 1991, as amended
3. Section 2-626 through 2-676 of the Hartford Municipal Code
4. Executive Orders Numbers 3 & 17 of the State of Connecticut
5. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

**1.10.9** The SP shall execute the attached “On-Street Parking and Citation Management Agreement”.

**1.10.10** Agree that periodic payments to the S P will be made as agreed upon in the executed contract with the HPA.

**1.10.11** Agree that the contract between the HPA and the SP shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the

State of Connecticut and the ordinances of the City of Hartford.

**1.11 Tax Status**

In accordance with Chapter 2, Section 2-548(a) (4) of the Municipal Code of the City of Hartford, Proposers must be current on all tax obligations to the City of Hartford. A Proposer found to be delinquent in the payment of personal or real property taxes, or found to be the owner of an interest of twenty-five percent (25%) or more in a corporation or other business entity that is delinquent in the payment of personal or real property taxes **shall not be considered for contract award**.

**1.12 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990**

The HPA complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, and in so doing requires those that contract with the HPA abide by the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; Public Law 101-336, as applicable.

**1.13 Additional Information and Revisions to Proposals**

Information may be provided to prospective Proposers for the purpose of clarification to assure full understanding of and responsiveness to the RFP requirements. Prospective Proposers shall be afforded fair and equal treatment with respect to access to additional information and revision of proposals as long as questions or requests for information are submitted by November 8, 2005 prior to the proposal submission date.

**1.14 Disqualification of Proposal**

Factors such as, but not limited to, the following may disqualify a Proposer without further consideration:

- Any of the required forms are left blank or are materially altered;
- Any document or item necessary to the proposal is incomplete, improperly executed, indefinite, ambiguous, or is missing;
- Proposer does not attend the mandatory pre-conference on Friday, October 14, 2005 at 10:00 AM at the offices of the Hartford Parking Authority, 155 Morgan Street, Hartford, CT 06103;
- Evidence of collusion among Proposers;
- Any attempt to improperly influence any member of the City Selection Committee;

- A Proposer's default under any type of agreement, which resulted in the termination of that agreement; or
- Existence of any unresolved litigation between the Proposer and the HPA or the City of Hartford.

Proposals shall be prepared and submitted in accordance with the provisions of these RFP instructions and specifications.

**1.15 Selection Procedures are as follows:**

**1.15.1** The HPA reserves the right to reject any or all proposals or parts thereof for any reasons, to negotiate changes to proposal terms, and to waive minor inconsistencies with the RFP. The HPA reserves the right to make a selection on the basis of qualifications, experience in providing similar services elsewhere and the proposal's responsiveness to the RFP requirements.

**1.15.2** Proposers submitting the best proposals may be invited to an interview with the Selection Committee prior to final recommendation for contract award. The HPA reserves the right to make an award solely on the basis of the proposals submitted.

**1.15.3** The HPA intends to enter into a contract with the most responsible Proposer whose proposal is determined to be in the best interests of the HPA.

**1.16 Schedule For Selection**

The following is HPA's anticipated schedule for pre-qualification, SP selection, and contract award. This schedule is subject to change.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Pre-proposal conference   | Friday, October 14,<br>2005, at 10:00 AM |
| 2. Submission of proposals   | Monday, November<br>14, 2005 at 3:30 PM  |
| 3. Filing of Selection Committee's report<br>recommending selection to the<br>Hartford Parking Authority | Wednesday,<br>November 30, 2005          |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 4. Hartford Parking Authority review,<br>consideration, and vote on<br>Selection Committee's recommendation | Thursday, December<br>8, 2005          |
| 5. Commencement of Contract   | Wednesday, February<br>1, 2006 8:00 AM |

## **2.0 PROPOSAL FORMAT**

### **2.1 Organization and Content**

Proposals must be bound, paginated, indexed and numbered consecutively. All Proposals must be signed by the firm's authorized official.

The proposal must also provide the name, title, address, telephone numbers, facsimile number and email address for the individual with authority to negotiate and contractually bind the firm, and for those who may be contacted for the purpose of clarifying the information provided therein.

All proposal submissions and materials become property of the HPA and will not be returned.

#### **2.1.1 Cover Letter**

Proposers shall submit a cover letter, addressed to Mr. James J. Kopencey, Executive Director, Hartford Parking Authority, 155 Morgan Street, Hartford, Connecticut 06103 signed by an authorized principal or agent of the Proposer, which provides an overview of the Proposer's proposal, as well as the name, title and phone number of the person to whom the HPA may direct questions concerning the proposal. The letter should also include a statement by the Proposer accepting all terms and conditions contained in this RFP, signed by an officer or other individual with authority to bind the firm.

#### **2.1.2 Table of Contents**

A Table of Contents of the material contained in the proposal shall follow the cover letter.

#### **2.1.3 Detailed Proposal**

In addition to the Proposer's detailed response to this RFP, the following items below must be clearly and comprehensively addressed:

#### **2.1.4 Executive Summary**

This section should contain an outline of the Proposer's general approach along with a brief statement of the salient features, functions, and services of the proposal response, including conclusions and general recommendations.

### **2.1.5 Firm Background**

This section should include a brief description and history of the firm. If the Proposer is a subsidiary of a larger organization, this information should be included, if available, for both parent and proposing entity.

#### **2.1.5.1 Business Relationships**

Proposer must describe the use of sub-contractors, specifically identifying the special skills or expertise which they will contribute to the project, as follows:

1. Identify whether the proposing entity is a subsidiary and whether its performance of the required Contract terms and conditions will be guaranteed by the parent company.
2. If Proposer intends to use a subsidiary or other entity to perform any of the Proposer's financial obligations under the contract, this fact must be disclosed.
3. Provide full information concerning the nature and structure of any subcontractor's relevant to this proposal, including which entity will be providing each contract service component.

### **2.1.6 Compliance Statement**

The Proposer must discuss in detail, each item under Sections 4.0 and 5.0 indicating clearly and thoroughly how each requirement is to be met. The proposer is also encouraged to provide as much information as possible for Section 6.0. Reiteration of the RFP wording will not qualify as a response. Include as much detail as possible and include at a minimum the following:

1. A complete detailed statement of the work to be performed under the contract. This statement should demonstrate the Proposer's understanding of the project, technical skills, and ability to meet the HPA's objectives;
2. A specific statement of compliance or exception to each task and deliverable;
3. A specific statement of acceptance of the RFP requirements, or any exceptions to them; and
4. A statement of the Proposer's assessment of any anticipated major difficulties it will have in completing the project.

Included in the RFP is a compliance matrix (Appendix C) that lists all of the sections for which the HPA requires a Proposer response. Proposers shall complete this matrix and submit it with their proposals as an Appendix. The response to each area will use one of the following. Please indicate if any changes will be customized or modified:

- Yes, service and products fully comply
- Service and products partially comply – customizations/modifications possible to fully comply - no additional cost
- Modifications to service and products required to comply - no additional cost
- Service and products partially comply – modifications possible to fully comply at additional cost
- Modifications to service and products required to comply at additional cost
- Service and products partially comply – modifications not possible
- No, service and products does not comply – modifications not possible

#### **2.1.7 Proposer Capability**

Demonstrate specific capabilities available to the project to meet the requirements based on the following:

1. Experience, demonstrated capability, and availability of qualified full time key technical and management personnel to be assigned to this project as well as a staffing plan for project implementation;
2. Demonstrated familiarity and experience in the successful design, implementation, provision and operation of current similar projects;
3. A thorough and comprehensive statement describing each system element, feature, service, etc. required under the Scope of Services, including how each of these relates to the references provided;
4. Full disclosure, including cost data, on the Proposer's system's upgrades during the term of the Contract;
5. Capability to respond to citizen inquiries/complaints including a detailed description of the method by which these inquiries will be handled; and

6. Proof of past performance in meeting cost, schedule, and technical bid requirements and in operating at a level satisfactory to the customer. Proposer must detail its plan for managing and implementing this project and document all user documentation and training to be provided.

### **2.1.8 Prior Experience**

The Proposer is to include descriptions of similar systems and municipalities that are currently in operation by the Proposer along with references and main contact information in order for the HPA to visit or contact existing or former clients to verify information contained in the proposal.

Proposer is required to provide five recent reference contacts from existing or previous accounts. These should be of similar size, complexity and nature to the City of Hartford. Joint ventures should provide similar references for each venture partner. The HPA will utilize these references to validate the Proposer's past performance and delivery capabilities.

Proposer shall include the following information for each reference provided:

- Agency name
- Population served
- Agencies served
- Contact name
- Contact address
- Contact phone
- Contact E-mail address
- Products installed
- Brief narrative description of the project
- Narrative descriptions should do more than list a name, location, project title, and dollar amount. It is the Proposer's responsibility to adequately show capabilities in each of the major project areas, i.e.:
  - SP and subcontractor experience
  - Local government experience
  - Project management experience
  - Quality assurance capabilities
  - Service, equipment and product integration experience
  - Technical capabilities
  - Product enhancement capabilities



- Revenue enhancement capabilities

### **2.1.9 Proposer Profile and Financial Statements**

Provide five (5) years of most recent certified audited financial statements for the Proposer and any parent organization, as well as other financial information the Proposer feels will assist the HPA in ascertaining the fiscal health of the Proposer.

This section also requests information regarding the Proposer's experience with on-street parking and PCMIS. Provide a complete profile with the following required information:

- Company name
- Contact person
- Telephone number
- Fax number
- Local address
- Headquarters address
- Number of years in operation
- Number of years in the parking management business
- Number of years using the current name
- Parking Meter Collection and Maintenance Experience
- Ticket Processing and Collections Experience
- Parking Adjudication Support Experience
- Experience in related technology
- Previous business name(s), if applicable
- Company size information for current fiscal year:
  - Assets
  - Net income after taxes
- Company size information for previous fiscal year:
  - Assets
  - Net income after taxes
- Percent of total income attributable to the service and products proposed
- Full service branch locations
- Number of employees in each of the following categories:
  - Management
  - Marketing/Sales
  - Administration
  - Customer Support
  - Other (Identify)
  - Total, all categories

- For each subcontractor:
  - Name
  - References
  - Responsibilities
  - Project Management Plan

#### **2.1.10 Miscellaneous and Additional Information**

Provide a clear and detailed list of any miscellaneous information pertinent to the Project, and any other standard technical data and brochures that informs the HPA of the Proposer's capabilities.

#### **2.1.11 Compensation**

All parking meter revenue is the property of the HPA. All parking violations revenue shall be the property of the HPA. Compensation to the SP shall be in the form of a Base Management Fee and a percentage of the money collected from parking tickets. The salary and wages of eight (8) fully trained and equipped Parking Violations Officers shall be the only reimbursable expense. The salary and wages for the eight (8) fully trained and equipped Parking Violations Officers shall be reimbursed based on payroll records and corresponding reports documenting enforcement activity. The amount shown on the Bid Form (Schedule A) for Parking Violations Officers shall show the actual hourly compensation to each Parking Violations Officer and the compensation request per hour for to the Bidder for Parking Violations Officers. Should the HPA seek or the Proposer suggest additional hours of enforcement staff or suggest that additional staff be added, the amount stated per hour shall be the sole basis to determine the additional reimbursable expense for Parking Violations Officers. No overtime will be paid to any of the SP's staff. No additional compensation will be provided. Time sheets/cards shall be presented and audited monthly to determine the magnitude of this reimbursable expense.

***The HPA is not bound to select the Proposer who proposes what might appear to be the best financial plan.*** The pricing and revenue plan is one of multiple criteria that will be used in selecting a SP. The HPA reserves the right to negotiate fees and payment schedules with the SP.

#### **2.1.12 Proposal Preparation Costs**

The HPA will not be liable for any costs incurred in the preparation of the response to this RFP.

### 2.1.13 Required Forms

Bidder's EEO Report: As a condition of doing business with the HPA, the SP must be certified by the City as an Equal Employment Opportunity Employer. The Bidder's *EEO Report* form, available at, [http://www.hartford.gov/purchasing/EEO\\_Repo\\_files/EEO\\_Report.pdf](http://www.hartford.gov/purchasing/EEO_Repo_files/EEO_Report.pdf) is an integral part of this proposal. **Please complete the form in its entirety and return it, with an original signature affixed,** with the submitted proposal.

Taxpayer's Identification Number: Each Proposer, whether an individual, proprietor, partnership or a nonprofit corporation or organization must fill out and submit with its proposal the Internal Revenue Service Form W-9, *Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification*.

All Proposals must be signed by an authorized representative of the Proposer. Unsigned proposals cannot and will not be considered.

### **3.0 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND**

The purpose of this RFP is to improve all aspects of the City's on-street parking related functions, promote compliance with parking regulations and to provide the highest level of customer service possible while simultaneously achieving maximum revenue generation through efficient collection. The HPA is seeking to have multiple on-street parking related functions associated with parking citation and inventory management such as ticket issuance, ticket processing, appeals, permitting, noticing, ticket collection, meter operations, and parking regulated signage integrated into a unified and user-friendly turnkey system.

For a detailed background on historical parking trends in Hartford, see Exhibit A.

1. City of Hartford Parking Tickets and Related System and Processes, March 2001.
2. Parking System Management Evaluation Parking Meter Program. July 1998.
3. See the City of Hartford's Parking Related Ordinances, Section 22, and online at [www.municode.com](http://www.municode.com)

## **4.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES**

### **4.1 General Responsibilities**

The primary responsibility of the SP will be to convert the City's current System functions and related data and to provide and operate an up-to-date, approved, fully operational and integrated PCMIS covering all requested aspects of this RFP including but not limited to: all necessary personnel, hardware, software, database and inventory management, communications, reporting, forms, noticing, imaging, GIS, handhelds, bar-coding and support services. Any reference herein to the "System" shall mean all the features and functions, hardware, software, data and related aspects that in any way affect the operations of the PCMIS.

The SP will provide adequate staff with the proper training, background and experience to carry out services such as ticket issuance and collection, meter maintenance and collection, data entry, payment application, refund processing and other necessary customer service related functions.

The following is a summary of the major functions, features and services expected to be performed and provided by the SP and the System. The SP should at a minimum be capable of providing the parking industry standard of these functions, features and services, as well as provide comparable functions, services and features offered and used by comparable or larger municipalities that have current contracts with the Proposer.

### **4.2 System Objectives**

The PCMIS shall be able to:

1. Accommodate citation issuance of up to 300,000 or more annually;
2. Facilitate a more complete collection of citation payments;
3. Support and monitor productivity in the following areas: citation issuance, processing and collections and meter collections;
4. Provide immediate on-line, real time access to information and transactions associated with citation issuance, processing, and collections. System must be web-enabled and user-friendly;
5. Provide comprehensive accounting and audit trails necessary for revenue control;
6. Provide reporting on operational performance, statistical and financial information for analysis and management review;
7. Provide professional, clear, prompt and efficient customer service; and
8. Monitor and maintain detailed history of the life cycle of all issued citations.

### **4.3 Preferred Requirements**

It is crucial to the HPA that the Proposers demonstrate a high level of systemic and technological sophistication, parking experience, and proven success in the management of ticket, meter and other parking related matters that will enable the HPA to continually improve, refine and stay current in its on-street parking management functions. All Proposers must complete the Experience Matrix included in Attachment B. All claims must be documented with client names and reference information.

1. In three cities, at least five (“5”) years experience in providing violations processing Systems for a parking or traffic regulatory entity which issues at least 200,000 parking citations annually;
2. In three cities, at least five years experience in providing on-street parking consulting;
3. In three cities, at least three years experience in providing Systems and services to support meter management; booting and towing residential permit parking;
4. In three cities, at least two years experience in providing Integrated Voice Response Systems/Internet Payment Options; and
5. At least two years experience interfacing with the following Motor Vehicle Departments: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Florida, and Pennsylvania.

### **4.4 Reporting**

The PCMIS should have flexible, comprehensive and integrated reporting capabilities to allow for the monitoring, review and analysis of all System related activities, transactions and performance. List the reports that your System is able to provide, the data collected, and its reporting significance. Ad Hoc reporting capabilities such as, but not limited to, parking violation officer performance, the number of citations issued by geographic locations, summonses issued by violation type by officer, parking meter income by zone, and the ability to track a particular citation from issuance to final disposition must also be available. All reports shall be available in time and date parameters.

### **4.5 Citation Management**

#### **4.5.1 Handheld Computers**

Parking citations shall be issued through handhelds. They will also be issued manually by the Hartford Police Department, (however 3 additional handhelds must be provided to the Police Department’s Traffic Division).

Describe and document in detail the performance capabilities and specifications of your proposed handheld System, the related functions and accessories available and how it interfaces with the PCMIS. The handhelds shall be capable of performing all industry standard functions necessary to maximize efficient citation issuance and data accuracy. The handhelds shall have features such as automatic pre-fill of street names, meter location, vehicle makes and models, and other commonly used data fields to minimize repetitive input. The handheld must be able to prompt for required fields that have not been entered and prevent the issuance of an incomplete ticket without acknowledgment by the issuing individual. The handheld should be capable of programming certain data fields and have specific character requirements to prevent bypassing required data collection fields. The handheld should be capable of issuing citations with barcodes. The handheld should be proven to endure harsh climates similar to the weather experienced in the Northeast and the physical hazards and environments to be encountered on the street (dropping, water, dirt, etc). Handhelds shall be able to perform full shifts without exchanging power supplies. Handhelds shall have the ability to hold all city street names, meter numbers, and “Hot Lists” such as scofflaws and stolen plates.

#### **4.5.2 Enforcement**

The Proposer must explain in a clear, comprehensive and detailed manner its capability for providing the following enforcement operation.

Provide eight (8) Parking Enforcement Officers to enforce meters and all other on-street parking regulations and issue parking citations. The Proposer may suggest an alternative number of personnel, but must clearly document and substantiate its recommendation. Notwithstanding the forgoing, the Proposer’s proposal shall provide for the specified eight (8) Parking Enforcement Officers.

Personnel are to be provided with all necessary equipment to ensure their security and safety and to efficiently conduct business. They will also act in an ambassadorial capacity, providing general information to the public upon request. The HPA’s intent is to reshape the image and role of the traditional Parking Enforcement Officer and the Proposer must provide adequate detail of its experience in accommodating this objective.

#### **4.5.3 Processing**

All data collected by the handhelds is to be downloaded into the Systems database at the end of each day's shifts at a minimum, to ensure up to date and accurate information. Manually issued tickets must be collected and input daily and available online within 24 hours of receipt. All data must be available to pull reports as listed by the Proposer to allow for accurate performance review, trend analysis, citation closure rates, GIS analysis, etc. Data being processed should allow for the ability to highlight and/or identify discrepancies such as breaks in citation issuance sequence, irregular and exception transactions, etc.

***Citation Payment and Fine Escalation*** - List and describe in detail all payment methods that are available by the Proposer. The PCMIS should be capable of recording and applying all whole and partial payment transactions, payments for tickets that have not been updated to the System, payment adjustments, automatic activation and deactivation of fine and penalty escalation, and NSF transactions to the proper citation(s) and accounts. Payments will be updated in real time as entered through the cashier or other payment options (Internet, Pay by Phone). The payment and transaction history of all citations is to be maintained and an audit trail provided. Describe the functions the Proposer's System is capable of as well as the security and audit features available to ensure the highest level of integrity to the cashing and payment aspects.

#### **4.5.4 Noticing**

The System shall have an integrated noticing System that automatically sends a minimum of two notices to individuals with unpaid citations (to be based on a schedule to be developed with the HPA). The System will be capable of automatically generating other types of notices and correspondence as it relates to the appeals process, receipt of full or partial payment and outstanding balances. The HPA and/or City representatives shall provide specifications to the Proposer as to form, content, sequence and timing of notices.

A record of all notices and correspondence sent, date sent, date received (if applicable) will be maintained under the appropriate citation account as well as the master database. These records are to be available for reporting purposes also.

The SP shall store all received correspondence and post stamped envelopes for use in possible future disputes. The Proposer's System will be able to image correspondence so it is immediately available for reference in the citation account.



The Proposer shall interact with the current collection agency, as contracted by Connecticut Conference on Municipalities, to collect outstanding parking ticket fines, which cannot be satisfied through programs such as Registration Non-Renewal or Impoundment. The Proposer shall be responsible for maintaining collection agency payments and updating the database on a monthly basis. The Proposer shall submit a plan for special collections of backlog debt that exists at the time of conversion and for ongoing efforts to capture *difficult-to-collect* accounts.

#### **4.5.5 DMV Interface**

Describe in detail how the Proposer and its System interacts with each Department of Motor Vehicles. The Proposer shall be able to interface with all the states referenced in Section 4.3. The Proposer shall be able to place registration holds on vehicles or apply other similar recourse available to it depending on the state.

The Proposer's System will maintain an up to date Connecticut motor vehicle registration owner file and regularly update the vehicle owner information of the top five states for which tickets have been issued. The Proposer's System shall have the ability to conduct a variety of different searches with full and partial information and the ability to skip trace or use other resources to identify current owner information. The System should be able to differentiate between issued multiple plates such as commercial and passenger vehicles. The System should have the ability to distinguish between current and previously registered owners of a plate.

#### **4.5.6 Appeals/Hearings**

The Proposer's System shall coordinate the scheduling and decision notification of appeals and hearings. Hearings officers will have access at the hearings to the individual's citation history via a networked computer at the Proposer's local customer service office. The hearings officer will render a final decision and enter the proper transactions into the System pursuant to state statute and city ordinance. Any fines or adjustments that are taken off hold will be due within a specified time period or the fine will begin to escalate and the applicable noticing process will apply. All procedures will be carried out in accordance with the Municipal Code of the City of Hartford and other applicable State and Federal Statutes.

### **4.6 Meter Management**

Six months after the System is in operation, the SP shall specify new parking

meters to replace most/many of the existing parking meters to provide better meter technology. Pay-and-Display multi-space meters that can accept credit cards shall be specified. The SP shall provide bid administration services and oversee the installation of new parking meters. All parking meters and meter related equipment shall be the property of the HPA. The SP shall also be responsible for re-keying all parking meters during the first 60 days under contract and painting all meter polls within 4 months of commencement of Work under the contract that emanates from this RFP.

The SP will detail and document a comprehensive integrated meter management subSystem capable of tracking, maintaining, and generating reports on all relevant meter related data. The SP will be responsible for providing personnel to perform all field and office operations needed to operate a meter program such as:

1. Meter maintenance;
2. Meter security (internal and external);
3. Adequacy of supplies i.e. receipts for Pay-and Display meters;
4. Fresh batteries for meters;
5. Meter signage;
6. Meter collections;
7. Meter auditing;
8. Meter counting and depositing; and
9. Meter administrative functions.

The meter management System at a minimum shall record the following meter information: meter maintenance performed, revenue collected, preventative maintenance and collection schedules, meter inventory (number, location), maintenance and collection routes, meter bagging, meter outages and work order history.

The subsystem will track inventory, complaints, outages and repairs. It will be integrated with the ticket data to insure timely and accurate customer service response and appeals support. Once the System records a meter outage, a work order will be automatically generated and will remain open until the meter is repaired. Handheld devices shall be able to capture basic information such as collection amounts and times and repair data from the meters.

SP shall ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

#### **4.7 Regulated Parking Sign Management**

There will be a subsystem that will inventory all parking regulated signs. It will track removal, addition, and maintenance. Information recorded will include location, sign type (Tow Zone, Handicapped, No Parking, etc.) time limit assigned (if applicable), date installed, date removed, date recorded

into System. Parking signage installation is currently a function of the City's Department of Public Works. The SP will assume this function. Efforts shall be coordinated through the HPA to establish an effective procedure to monitor parking sign removals, installations, and requests.

#### **4.8 Permit Management - Residential Permit Parking**

Describe and document in detail the Residential Permit Parking ("RPP") features, functions and capabilities of your System. The City does not currently have an RPP program, but may implement one if feasible.

#### **4.9 Booting and Towing**

Describe and document in detail the Booting and Towing features, functions, and capabilities of your System. The HPA does not currently have a Booting and Towing program, but may implement one if feasible. All towing is currently overseen by the Hartford Police Department.

#### **4.10 Special License Plates**

The PCMIS is to include the ability to process citations issued to lease, rental, and fleet vehicles. Describe and document in detail how the Proposer's System manages the various aspects of these types of vehicles to ensure collection of fines.

#### **4.11 On-street Parking Consulting and Public Relations**

The SP shall have parking management consulting experience and resources available to assist the HPA in providing the highest quality on-street parking services possible. List the types of services the Proposer has successfully provided in similar urban jurisdictions. Specifically, the SP will be expected to assist the HPA in educating the public in connection with on-street parking matters.

#### **4.12 Customer Service**

The ability to professionally, effectively and efficiently handle customers is of extreme importance to the HPA. The SP will be representing the HPA, and will be the first point of contact for the majority of customer interaction. A customer service center shall be located at the SP's main Hartford site and be open to the public during normal business hours 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM. Weekdays, except Thursday till 7:00 PM. The System will provide alternative points of contact such as telephone IVR, remote kiosk, drop boxes and the Internet, allowing the customer to obtain citation specific information and make payments. Describe in detail, the features, functions and capabilities to be provided by the SP and how these functions are integrated into the main citation management system.

#### **4.13 Additional Services and Options**

The Proposer may list and describe additional services, functions and features that it is able to provide which may not be specified or requested in the scope of services above. Describe how these aspects add value to the intended outcomes of your Proposal.

## **5.0 SYSTEM PERFORMANCE AND SECURITY REQUIREMENTS**

### **5.1 System Performance**

The System shall be capable of handling all anticipated volumes of data and transactions based on the described needs in this RFP. The on-line System shall be available to authorized HPA personnel at all times. Response time for all Systems should not exceed three seconds. The SP will maintain an aggregate on-line System uptime average of not less than 99% of available utilization time based on the hours of 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM weekdays. The SP will notify the HPA of any anticipated downtime at least one hour prior. The Proposer will provide the HPA with monthly reports as to the System's response and downtimes.

Any errors or malfunctions, emergency in nature or not, must be brought immediately to the HPA's attention and corrected to the HPA's satisfaction. The SP will be responsible for any revenue lost as a result of malfunctions or errors that are not corrected within 48 hours.

The SP will be responsible for maintaining an adequate inventory of spare parts to minimize downtime and disruption to the System.

### **5.2 System Security**

The System security features will have different access levels, allowing restricted access to the System feature and functions as authorized by the HPA. The System will time out users' access after a specified time to prevent unauthorized access. Describe in comprehensive detail the Proposer's security aspects.

The System will provide comprehensive audit capabilities, including but not limited to recording all transactions made by personnel on the PCMIS. Proper data control security measures shall be in place to prevent employees from damaging, altering, or compromising data.

### **5.3 System Acceptance**

Final acceptance of the System by the HPA will occur once the System has consistently met the performance requirements specified for a period of thirty (30) consecutive days. If the System fails to meet the performance standard after ninety (90) calendar days from the test start date, the HPA may, at its option, request a replacement for the System or terminate the Contract.

## **6.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

The HPA recognizes that the implementation of the complete On Street Parking Management Operation and PCMIS is a major undertaking that requires significant planning as well as comprehensive project management. This project management shall be the responsibility of the SP. Because of the size and complexity of the project, the HPA requires the SP to provide a dedicated Project Manager with sole responsibility for this contract. The HPA will provide a Contract Administrator to oversee the Operation and PCMIS contract. In addition, the City will provide contact staff to represent other related areas such as Parking Enforcement, Adjudication and Information Technology. The HPA requires the SP to include these additional area managers to participate in the “System(s)” implementation overview.

The Proposer shall describe the means and procedures to be employed to assure compliance with project deadlines. Included in the Proposer’s response shall be a detailed Project Plan that includes at a minimum the following level of detail:

- Detailed listing of all tasks to be performed with begin and end dates and person(s) responsible for each component of the Scope of Service including HPA tasks
- Identification of person(s) assigned to perform each task
- Clearly defined SP’s, subcontractor(s) and HPA responsibilities
- Critical milestones

### **6.1 Proposed “System(s) Information Access**

Required locations for proposed “System(s)” information access:

- Contract Administrator
- SP’s local office
- Parking Adjudication Office,
- Parking Enforcement Office
- Parking Enforcement Dispatch Office

### **6.2 Proposed System(s) Implementation**

After contract signing, the SP shall be required to provide a detailed “System(s)” Implementation Plan subject to approval by the HPA. This implementation plan shall include all project phases including service, products, design, programming, hardware installation, training, testing, final cut over and “System(s)” acceptance. SP(s) shall implement a timeline utilizing a standard project management program such as Microsoft Project. A timeline is required to assist in adhering to deadlines and tracking the progress of the project by primary task and all associated sub tasks.

### **6.2.1 Implementation of Network Environment**

The HPA requires the SP to coordinate with the City's IT department for the installation of any new wiring required for this project as well as certification of any existing wiring (network and electrical) to be utilized by the services and products. Any personnel provided by the SP for technical installation shall be properly licensed in Computer Network Wiring, etc.

The SP shall supply an "As Built" diagram of the wiring and switches installed and how they are connected to their products and network. The HPA also requires the SP to provide a base performance measurement before and after the cut to live. This measurement will include the signal loss of each cable, the length of the cable and a total "System(s)" loading/response time. The HPA plans to use these measurements as a baseline for future troubleshooting purposes. All network equipment shall support remote monitoring and be remotely manageable.

### **6.3 Proposed "System(s)" Interface**

This provides for the interface of new services, equipment and products and the existing service, equipment and products. The new "System(s)" will include connections to all required interfaces.

The proposed "System(s)" shall be based on the following configuration:

- TRAINING, TEST/Back-up services
- Operating software
- Spatial data storage strategy
- MIS database software
- Workstation operating software
- Sufficient workstation software licenses

#### **6.3.1 Requirements for Interfacing**

- Hardware and Network Requirements
- Workstation configuration
- Database Standards
- Graphical User Interface
- Control Measures
- Testing
- Availability Level

## **6.4 Proposed “System(s)” Hardware**

The new service and products, provided by the SP, shall utilize standard hardware. The HPA requires a fault tolerant solution or a solution that provides redundant hardware that will meet the current availability requirements. The services and products shall have enough processing power to execute commands in less than 1 second. Commands that search databases should return data within 1.5 seconds excluding outside database interfaces. The SP shall specify the latest server hardware available at the time of required installation (to be agreed upon by the SP and the HPA). The purpose is to ensure that the service and products have the most powerful processors that are available in the market place as close to the go-live date as is possible, taking into consideration the SP’s ability to support the software to this hardware.

Servers should remain hot backups for each other. If one fails, the others shall automatically assume the load and it shall be seamless to the users.

The proposed “System(s)” will use a DVD-ROM or optical media and tape for backups or history dumps of archived data. The proposed “System(s)” shall be capable of producing more than one copy at a time since the HPA plans to store one copy on-site and another off-site in a fireproof safe.

## **6.5 Hardware and Network Requirements**

**6.5.1** The SP is required to submit a detailed list of the mainframe or server equipment, the hardware peripherals, which will be committed to and utilized by this contract. In addition, the SP should provide the anticipated maintenance plan for the hardware. SP shall provide all maintenance on hand-held units, printers and chargers, plus any costs to return items to the factory. It shall be the SP’s sole responsibility to replace damaged equipment in a timely manner.

## **6.6 Software**

The SP is required to submit a detailed list of the resident software package, which will be committed to and utilized by this contract. Said software shall be customized to the HPA’s specifications with unlimited parameters for refining the parking operations and PCMIS. In addition, the SP should provide the anticipated maintenance plan for the software. Maintenance will be at the SP’s expense, plus any return costs associated. It shall be the SP’s responsibility to replace damaged software in a timely manner.

Proposed “System(s)” shall be maintained and operated with integrating software, with relationships established to allow retrieval and update of related information



across program areas. The proposed “System(s)” shall integrate software components stated in this section and maintain a central database, which supports all functions.

## **6.7 Conversions**

The City of Hartford has considerable legacy information for Parking Operation and PCMIS. The HPA will require the selected SP to map the conversion including the various elements, and complete the conversion.

### **6.7.1 Data Conversion**

The HPA wants to convert all existing history data from current systems to a format that will look the same as data created on the proposed “System(s)”. When users access this history information, all data fields need to be populated as much as possible with the legacy data from the current system. The HPA recognizes that there will be certain data fields with the proposed “System(s)” that may require null data because the current system does not contain equivalent data.

The HPA will determine the completion of the conversion according to its standards. The SP shall provide an anticipated timetable and work schedule for the conversion process.

### **6.7.2 Additional Conversions**

This RFP requires that, in the event the SP is not the existing contractor, the citation-processing database shall be initially loaded from a master file residing with the current contractor. The SP shall be required to perform an interface with the current PCMIS contractor to conduct conversion activities. It will be the SP's responsibility to do all programming and testing to ensure that the conversion has been successfully completed. It will be the City's and the existing PMIS contractor's responsibility to supply the data, as is, from the existing parking databases and for conversion purposes to define the storage format and describe the data elements stored in the databases.

The SP shall provide prior to implementation:

- The description, capabilities, operation and maintenance of all proposed and installed hardware and software written for the non-technical user and in the form of professional quality, published user manuals. Appropriate documentation updates shall be provided as changes occur. These shall be in a format, which can be

incorporated into the existing detailed system documentation. Required documentation shall include preparation and maintenance of manuals for non-technical end users providing hardware and transaction information.

- Initial and ongoing training, consultation and assistance to HPA staff in the operation of the “System(s)”, which shall include, but not be limited to, terminal operation, transaction/function usage, “System(s)” Management, report writing, and management orientation.
- All instructional materials for the training sessions including the preparation and maintenance of a quick reference guide on the operation of user equipment.

## **7.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA**

All proposals which meet the specifications of this RFP will be evaluated based on the criteria below. The HPA may choose at its discretion to reject any or all proposals, seek clarification, allow for minor corrections, and apply appropriate penalties in the evaluation or a combination thereof.

### **7.1 Proposer's experience, reputation, qualifications and proven effectiveness and efficiency in Comprehensive and Integrated On-street Parking Citation Management Services**

1. The Proposer has a minimum of five (5) years experience in providing full service parking ticket processing and collections to municipalities including the following functionality:
  - a. Violations processing and collections;
  - b. Meter management Systems and services;
  - c. Booting and towing Systems and services;
  - d. Residential permit parking Systems and services;
  - e. Integrated voice response Systems;
  - f. Internet citation payment System;
  - g. DMV interface in Connecticut and surrounding states referenced herein; and
  - h. On-street parking management consulting.
2. The proposal concisely and thoroughly details, substantiates, documents, and demonstrates extensive parking ticket processing and collections experience in three or more comparable municipalities with most or all Systems, features, and services being requested by the HPA.
3. The proposal concisely and thoroughly details, substantiates and demonstrates the SP's parking ticket processing and collection experience regarding background, growth, customer service, continual improvement, technological advancement, testing, debugging and implementing and provides the highest level of assurance that the System is proven and successfully operational in other municipalities and operating at maximum efficiency.

### **7.2 Scope of Services Compliance**

1. The Proposer's response provides highly detailed and comprehensive descriptions and documentation of the required

functions and features well above the detail requested in the RFP so as to allow for precise understanding that the Proposer possesses the highest level of expertise, knowledge, skills, resources and proficiency to fully execute and fulfill the expected demands of the PCMIS and its related services.

2. The proposal clearly and thoroughly demonstrates the ability to comply with all of the HPA's requirements and specifications for all the Systems and services and to implement, provide and operate such Systems and services at the highest level to achieve a user friendly, efficient and effective operation.
3. The proposal provides clear and documented evidence that substantiates the proposed System, functions features, and services are fully integrated, functional, user friendly, and customer service orientated.
4. The proposal clearly demonstrates in comprehensive detail and documentation the System's ability to maintain and secure the highest level of data and information integrity.
5. The Proposer demonstrates that the cost to perform the required functions, features and services are thoroughly and clearly detailed to assure the HPA that the cost benefit is being maximized and that there are no hidden costs.
6. The proposal provides the highest level of assurance that the planning, conversion, implementation and operation of the PCMIS and related services will be fully tested and online by October 31, 2005 and that continued development and enhancements will be ongoing throughout the term of the Contract.
7. The proposal provides in clear, comprehensive detail and documentation, the flow of its integrated data management and interrelated functions.

### **7.3 Operations Management Plan, Staff and Location of Facilities.**

1. The Proposer has a minimum of five years experience in citation management Systems installations and operations providing comparable or more functions and services to other current municipalities than is requested by the HPA.

2. The Proposer has submitted detailed references and locations of similar operations where the SP is currently operating.
3. The Proposer has clearly and thoroughly detailed, documented and substantiated its experience and ability to provide a highly efficient, effective and viable single point of contact role and responsibility of directly overseeing, managing, and ensuring the highest level of integrity of the citation management functions and services requested.
4. The Proposer has clearly detailed its ability to establish a customer service office (and auxiliary locations if needed) in Hartford to perform the functions and services requested that is conveniently located for oversight by the HPA and accessible to the general public for customer service related functions.
5. The Proposer has clearly and thoroughly documented and detailed experienced parking management personnel and resources available for assistance in all phases of on-street parking management such as fine structure analysis, route analysis, turnover analysis, enforcement strategies to ensure continued improvement and maximum efficiency.
6. The Proposer has given clear and specific detail regarding the background, education, qualifications and relevant experience of the individuals designated to provide services, especially those of the day-to-day program manager, and documentation of relevant and pertinent training and accreditation of each.
7. The Proposer has clearly demonstrated and documented its involvement and positive track record in community involvement.

## **8.0 Compensation to the SP**

### **8.1 Instructions**

Proposers are to provide pricing in accordance with Schedule “A”. The HPA is looking for the most cost-effective, revenue-generating proposal provided by the most qualified Proposer. Compensation is limited to the Base Management Fee which shall be presented as an “annual” figure and compensation for parking ticket collection to be stated as a percent of total parking ticket revenue collected, and reimbursement for the cost of enforcement staff to be stated hourly and annually.

### **8.2 Pricing Considerations**

**8.2.1** Pricing proposal should cover the duration of the contract however may vary by year.

**8.2.1.1** Data Conversion and Integration – No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for the complete conversion of existing data from the current legacy system to the new “System(s)”.

**8.2.1.2** Documentation - No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for required documentation.

**8.2.1.3** Support costs – No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for support costs including general administrative and IT support.

**8.2.1.4** Proposers Staff - Provide the cost for Parking Violations Officers. Parking Violation Officer’s must be stated separately on Schedule “A” and that cost shall include their equipment i.e. handheld ticket writers, printers and communication devices, uniforms, and training. To comply with the City of Hartford’s Living Wage Ordinance a separate line is provided to insert the actual hourly compensation paid to the Parking Violations Officers.

**8.2.1.5** Equipment - No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for the cost for all equipment and installation related labor. This cost should exclude equipment for Parking Violations Officers which is separately requested in Schedule “A”.

**8.2.1.6** Products – No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for the cost for any products and related maintenance and support cost for the specific product.

**8.2.1.7** No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for

training in all areas, including administrative, equipment and product.

**8.2.1.8** No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for implementation of service, equipment or products.

**8.2.1.9** No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for Customized Reports – Include cost for report format changes.

**8.2.1.10** No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for equipment and products supplied in connection with Work stemming from this RFP.

**8.2.1.11** No additional compensation shall be paid to the SP for any related maintenance, warranty and/or support costs.

**8.2.1.12** Compensation is limited to what is stated in 8.1 Instructions.

## **EXHIBIT A**

### **For Informational Purposes Only for HPA RFP #090105 Not for Distribution**

#### **DRAFT**

### **City of Hartford Parking Tickets and Related System and Processes, March 2001.**

In accordance with our annual audit plan, an examination was completed in December 2000 of parking tickets and associated processes and Systems utilized by the City of Hartford. Our examination included reviews of related operations in the Finance, Police and Public Works departments. The purpose of the examination was to evaluate and test internal accounting and operating controls, the accuracy and propriety of transactions processed, and to recommend improvements where required.

The results of our examination were reviewed with W. Cochran, Acting Director, Finance; B. Marquis, Chief of Police; A. Miller, Director, Department of Public Works; A. Ouellette, Director, Information Services; and, other responsible members of operating management. The summary, which follows, includes only exceptions disclosed and recommended operating improvements. For each reported item, management agreed to implement submitted recommendations or take other appropriate corrective action unless specifically indicated otherwise.

#### **Background**

The Police, Finance, Public Works and Information Services departments are all involved in the parking enforcement and fee collection operations of the City of Hartford (the City).

The Police Department (HPD) is responsible for enforcing violations, issuing tickets, taking action against scofflaws, bagging meters for special events and recording tickets in the Parking Ticket Application (the System). The Tax Department (Tax) is responsible for collecting fines and penalties, maintaining the hard copy of tickets once they have been recorded in the System, recording adjustments to fines and penalties, issuing delinquency notices for the non-payment of tickets, producing System management reports and providing customer service with regard to contested tickets and general questions and complaints. Additionally, Tax Department is responsible for ensuring that the information maintained in the System is accurate and up-to-date. The Department of Public Works (DPW) is responsible for maintaining and collecting revenue from parking meters, determining areas to be posted with parking restrictions and installing and maintaining related signage, providing guidance to parking controllers as needed on a daily basis, conducting initial hearings for protested tickets and coordinating subsequent reconsideration hearings with Tax and the hearing officers as required. In addition, the DPW makes adjustments to fines and penalties based on the results of hearing officer recommendations in the System. Information Services is responsible for overall maintenance of the hardware and related System, printing delinquency notices, loading and translating tapes from both Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and the bank into the database and maintaining System security.

During the four fiscal years ended June 30, 2000 the HPD issued an average of about 65,000 tickets per year resulting in average annual collectible balances with fines and penalties of about \$3.1 million. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 2000 57,598 tickets were issued which resulted in collectible balances totaling about \$2.6 million. As of January 16, 2001 \$805,000 of the \$2.6 million had been collected; \$266,000 had been written off and about \$1.5 million remained to be collected. As of December 31, 2000 more than \$7.6 million in fines and penalties were outstanding of which more than 90% were between three months and five years old.



## General

In general we found that policies and procedures were not documented and the Parking Ticket System was inefficient and did not contain adequate security controls, audit trails, edits and management reports. In addition, we found that the System data was in many instances not accurate and/or complete and that procedures and controls over adjustments were not adequate. Finally, we found that the enforcement of parking violations needed improvement and efforts to collect parking fines and penalties were not adequate.

## Parking Ticket Administration

Various reviews of the distribution, collection and data entry of parking tickets disclosed that procedures and controls to ensure that all parking tickets are accounted for and recorded in the System accurately and in a timely manner needed improvement.

1. Parking tickets are pre-numbered and arranged in books of twenty-five. We noted in the most recent order of tickets, however, that although tickets were pre-numbered, they were not in sequential order. We also noted that tickets are not accounted for as they are handed out to Parking Controllers and Police Officers. This makes it virtually impossible to track and account for tickets handed out and subsequently issued. HPD management agreed to work with the Purchasing Division to ensure that tickets are pre-numbered and in sequential order by book when ordered. In addition, HPD management agreed to distribute ticket books to Police Officers and Parking Controllers in sequential order, maintain a record of the tickets that are assigned to each employee and take action to identify, track and follow-up on missing tickets.
2. Parking Controllers and Police Officers were using a duplicate series of ticket numbers. Due to an error made by the ticket SP, the last order of 25,000 tickets had to be reproduced. The reproduced tickets were generated with the same ticket numbers as the original order; however, the HPD did not segregate and destroy the bad tickets from the original order. Consequently, tickets with duplicate numbers were being distributed and used by Officers and Parking Controllers. This creates a significant problem because a System control edit will not allow duplicate ticket numbers to be entered to the System. As a result, only the first of the two tickets with duplicate numbers entered to the System will be accepted and will show as a balance due. HPD management took immediate action to stop the distribution and issuance of the tickets with duplicate numbers and agreed to determine the number of tickets with duplicate numbers issued and the extent of related potential lost revenues. Based upon their most recent efforts, HPD management believes that no more than 3,000 of the 25,000 tickets with duplicate numbers will be issued. If all the 3,000 tickets with duplicate numbers were distributed and issued we estimated that more than \$45,000 of ticket fines, exclusive of any penalties, is at risk of being collected. HPD management agreed to determine the feasibility of identifying the tickets with duplicate numbers that were issued but not entered to the System and taking the necessary action to ensure that related balances due are collected.
3. Procedures and controls needed improvement to ensure that once tickets are distributed to Officers and Controllers they are accounted for and recorded in the System. Generally, Officers and Controllers remove the issued tickets from their book at the end of each day and place them in a locked box in the Traffic or Patrol Division office. The next day a Traffic Division Officer gathers tickets from the two boxes and delivers them to the Data Entry operation at HPD. We found that tickets are not counted and batched prior to being transported to Data Entry. Consequently, there is no way to determine if all issued tickets are delivered to Data Entry and subsequently recorded in the System. HPD management agreed to ensure that all tickets are counted and batched prior to being transported to Data Entry. In addition, HPD management agreed to establish procedures and controls to ensure that all tickets are subsequently recorded in the System.
4. Voided and spoiled tickets were not being accounted for and recorded as such in the System. Consequently, there is no way to determine if a missing ticket was voided, spoiled or issued but lost before being recorded in the System. We recommended and HPD management agreed to establish procedures and controls to account for and record all tickets and ensure that voided or spoiled tickets are reflected accordingly in the System. In addition, HPD management agreed to take action to identify and determine the reasons for tickets not being recorded in the System.

5. Parking ticket data was not being recorded in the System in a timely fashion. Under the best of circumstances, it takes at least 24 hours from the time a ticket is issued until it is recorded in the System. We noted, however, that this generally takes significantly more than 24 hours. At the start of our review there was more than a six-month backlog of issued but unrecorded tickets. The untimely recording of tickets in the System can cause a number of problems including payments made against unrecorded tickets; inaccurate/incomplete billings; increased errors, System maintenance and manual effort; additional protests and hearings; and, poor customer relations. It should be noted that during our review the backlog of tickets had almost been eliminated, however by the end of our review the backlog of tickets waiting to be entered to the System had again risen to about three weeks of activity. HPD management indicated that parking ticket data was not being recorded in the System in a timely manner because of a lack of data entry personnel. HPD management agreed to take action to identify the resources necessary to ensure that tickets are recorded in the System in a timely manner.
6. For a number of reasons, data entry personnel have difficulty reading and accurately recording in the System the registration numbers noted on tickets. As a result it is not uncommon for registration numbers recorded in the System to be incorrect and the related fines and penalties uncollectible. Utilizing handheld computers to create tickets would greatly reduce the number of incorrect registration numbers recorded in the System and increase the likely hood of collecting related fines and penalties. In addition, we estimated that using handheld computer technology would eliminate the need for at least one data entry employee resulting in annual cost savings of about \$30,000.

### **Parking Controllers**

There are six authorized Parking Controller positions in the Traffic Division. These employees are responsible for enforcing parking regulations within six designated patrol areas. The standard workday for Parking Controllers is from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Various reviews of the duties and responsibilities of Parking Controllers and related processes and operations disclosed the following.

1. Policies, procedures and controls needed improvement to ensure that the enforcement of parking meters is effective and efficient and that the coverage of metered areas and the number of tickets issued are maximized. In the months prior to our review, HPD management began tracking certain information pertaining to Parking Controller activities, however, due to the manual nature of the process and reliance on employees to complete the related forms in an accurate and timely manner the information was somewhat limited.
  - a. Currently all six of the authorized Parking Controller positions are filled, however one of these individuals has been on vacation or under the Family Leave Medical Act since August 17, 2000 and two others had frequent or extended absences from work. Consequently only three of these individuals have been available to enforce parking in the six designated patrol areas during this period. We also found that Controllers spend an average of about 45% of their day performing other duties including office work, training, crossing guard assignments and related time traveling to and from these assignments. This reduces the time Controllers are available to perform patrol and ticket writing duties. As a result, enforcement is not as effective as it should be and the number of tickets issued is negatively impacted. We found that during the four fiscal years ending June 30, 2000 the number of tickets written has continually declined on a department wide basis from 70,169 to 57,596. During this same period the dollar value of parking ticket fines and penalties decreased from \$3.4 million to \$2.6 million respectively. Due to the previously disclosed limitations of the System, we were unable to determine if the decline in the number of tickets issued was associated with Parking Controllers, Police Officers or a combination of both.
  - b. All streets and areas with meters were not being patrolled on a regular basis. We found that one area located next to St. Francis Hospital with about 60 meters appeared to have limited or no coverage. In addition, due to the lack of effective

management information and related reports we were unable to verify that all the streets and related meters in the six designated patrol areas were being adequately and regularly enforced. Based on a review of two weeks of daily logs maintained by Controllers, it appeared that certain streets and related meters were not being regularly patrolled for parking violators and that overall coverage in general was sporadic. We performed a review of the area with 60 meters noted above that was not being patrolled on three separate occasions and found that generally, most of the meters were occupied, however 88% of the patrons had not paid the required fees and were in violation. Based on even 50% meter occupancy with fee payment compliance, we estimated that the City could be losing as much as \$11,000 in parking meter revenue per year in this area alone. HPD management indicated that the area noted above was somewhat remote and was not being covered by Controllers due to transportation issues and ensuring that other higher priority routes are covered. HPD management agreed to look into options to provide coverage for these meters including working with Hospital management to determine if their security staff would be able and willing to take over related enforcement responsibilities.

- c. There are significant variances between the average number of tickets issued per Controller per day. Our review of daily activity logs maintained by Controllers during the two-week period ended November 30, 2000 disclosed that the average number of tickets issued per Controller per day ranged from about 19 to 59. The five Parking Controllers combined wrote an average of approximately 41 parking tickets per day during the period reviewed. HPD management indicated that some of the variance noted in the number of tickets issued per Controller may be attributed to the different patrol areas. According to a consultant's report issued in 1998 a Parking Controller should be averaging 60 to 80 parking citations per day in a typical downtown parking meter environment that is comparable to Hartford. If the four Parking Controllers currently working full time issued an average of 60 parking citations per day we estimated that an additional 19,000 tickets could be issued on an annual basis with a face value of about \$285,000.
- d. The period requiring payment at most parking meters is between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. We noted, however, that enforcement only generally occurs between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. Individuals who regularly park at metered spaces may be aware of this and take advantage of the situation by only paying required fees during the hours that the Controllers work. We performed a review of 135 occupied meters on four streets between 3:15 and 3:45 p.m. and found that 70 or 52% of them indicated that a violation had occurred and that four other meters were broken. None of the vehicles that were parked in violation were ticketed.
- e. We performed a review of meters on seven streets on different days of the week between 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. and noted that of the 170 occupied spaces, 11 meters were inoperable and time had expired at 116 or 72% of the remaining 159 meters. A few of the violators were food vendors who were not feeding the meters as required. We did note tickets on two of the 116 vehicles' windshields. City management indicated that they were currently working to address this issue by selling related spaces to the food vendors.
- f. The City currently has about 1,800 parking meters and generated about \$850,000 or about \$475 per meter in revenue from them during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2000. Based on an 8 hour workday and approximately 250 workdays per year we estimated that the 1,800 meters could generate more than \$1.8 million in revenue if the meters were continually in use and the fees were paid as required. While 100% use and compliance with fee payment at meters is unlikely, we believe that meter revenue could be considerably increased with better parking enforcement and an improvement in the collection of parking ticket fines and penalties.

HPD management agreed to review the resources and time committed to enforcement by Controllers and Police Officers and consider how to better deploy existing staff or hire additional staff to ensure that all patrol areas are adequately covered on a daily basis. In addition, HPD management agreed to take action to make improvements as deemed necessary to increase and maximize the efficiency and productivity of Controllers. Finally, HPD management agreed to determine the feasibility of changing enforcement hours to coincide with the periods requiring payment at meters. This coverage will provide the incentive necessary to ensure that people are paying to park at metered spaces as required at all times throughout the day.

2. One of the responsibilities of the Traffic Division is to identify and take appropriate action against repeat offenders with five or more unpaid citations otherwise known as scofflaws. We found that the current process for identifying and taking enforcement actions against scofflaws is for the most part inefficient and ineffective and related policies and procedures are not documented. At the time of our review there were about 4,009 scofflaws with 32,985 outstanding tickets totaling more than \$1.9 million. We noted that generally, one sworn Officer is assigned to address scofflaws. This individual must use a roughly 30-page document produced intermittently by the Tax Division as a basis for identifying scofflaws. In addition, because the listing is outdated almost from the time it is printed, when a potential scofflaw is identified, the Officer must call the Tax Division to verify that the tickets are still outstanding. HPD management indicated that they have had difficulty contacting the Tax Office at times to verify scofflaw data. We also noted that Controllers who issue a majority of citations are not involved in scofflaw enforcement. HPD management agreed to work with Tax management to determine the feasibility of using police radios to confirm the accuracy of the scofflaw listing. The use of hand held computers to issue tickets would greatly enhance the ability to identify and take necessary action against scofflaws including the resolution of unpaid tickets and the collection of related fines.
3. During the review of the Parking Controllers' activity sheets it was noted that on at least three separate occasions for two-day periods in July and September 2000 the Traffic Division apparently ran out of tickets. During these periods, the Controllers reported to work but were unable to do their job writing tickets. In addition, we estimated that more than \$18,450 in parking ticket revenue was lost because of the lack of ticket stock. HPD management agreed to work with the Purchasing Division to ensure that an adequate and uninterrupted supply of parking tickets is maintained and available for use by all employees responsible for issuing tickets.

### **Parking Ticket System**

The Parking Ticket application (the System) was developed for the City by Reudgen & Johnson, Inc. in 1988 and is operated on an AS400 midrange hardware platform. Various tests of security and access controls and reviews of how the System is utilized by Tax, HPD and DPW employees disclosed the following.

1. A consultant developed the System, which is now more than 12 years old, specifically for the City. Due to problems with the consultant during the development and implementation of the System, it was never fully completed and never satisfied the specifications and requirements of the Tax Division. In addition, the City never received detailed documentation necessary to maintain and operate the System. The only documentation available in the Tax Division is that which users of the System developed over time and largely consists of samples of System menus, screen prints and reports. We also noted that the only individual who had an in depth knowledge of and experience with the System retired in November 1999. The remaining Tax Division staff do not have this level of knowledge and expertise regarding the System, nor do they have the time or documentation required to learn what they need to know in order to maintain and operate the System as required. If any maintenance or program changes are required on the System in the future a consultant will have to be hired to perform them.
2. The System and related processes do not have the functionality or technical capabilities required to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of its users and related operations. There are a number of inherent limitations of the System and related processes that adversely impact the collection of unpaid fines; reduce the ability to identify and take action against scofflaws; maintain accurate and up-to-date

data; and, create meaningful management and user reports in a timely manner. Tax management agreed that the existing System is inadequate and obsolete and that consideration should be given to either purchasing a new System or outsourcing the process to a third party administrator.

3. We noted numerous instances where System data such as registration numbers were incorrect rendering related fines and penalties uncollectible. We believe that many of the errors noted were most likely made by Controllers when recording information on the tickets or by data entry personnel when either recording the data in the System or trying to read and interpret the data on the tickets. These errors would be substantially reduced with the use of handheld computers when issuing tickets.
4. The System does not provide adequate information regarding fines, penalties and adjustment history on a ticket level basis. We found that numerous screens must be accessed and other inquiries made to determine the dollar amount of the original fine, additional penalties imposed and adjustments made on a ticket. This makes the System cumbersome to work with and difficult to determine the transaction history on a ticket. System Security and access controls needed improvement. Various tests and reviews disclosed the following:
  - a. The System does not provide an audit trail that associates users with the transactions that they process. This does not provide an adequate level of control over, or management information on, critical transactions such as adjustments. It is unlikely that this exposure can be addressed without a significant and costly programming effort. Tax management agreed to determine the feasibility of programming the System to associate users with the transactions they process. In addition, this should be a requirement in any System that is purchased in the future.
  - b. One individual was using the password of an employee who retired in November 1999. This password is extremely powerful and enables the user the capability to perform almost all System functions. We were unable to determine if any other employees were aware of and/or were using this password. Tax management took immediate action to delete the retired employee's password from the System and agreed to review all passwords and access capabilities to ensure that users can only perform tasks and functions that are necessary to perform their jobs. In addition, Tax management agreed to ensure that passwords are promptly deleted in the future as required.
5. The System does not provide adequate management information regarding adjustments to fines and penalties. When certain adjustments are made to fines and penalties, the System will note the related code utilized in the transaction record. We noted, however, that the System does not note and maintain transaction codes for two commonly used adjustments. The System does not note when fines and penalties are either "E" excused or "R" reduced. Consequently, we were unable to determine the number and dollar value of these adjustments. Tax management agreed to determine the feasibility of programming the System so that adjustments for fines and penalties that are excused and reduced can be identified and quantified.
6. No data has been purged from the System since it went into production in 1988. Consequently, the System contains a significant amount of unnecessary data, which can negatively impact the efficiency, and effectiveness of its operation. Tax management indicated that purging data from the System would cost between \$12,000 and \$14,000 and that this is not a high priority from a budget standpoint. If the decision is made to continue to use the System for an extended period of time Tax management agreed to take action to have old, outdated and unnecessary data purged from the System.

## **Tax Division**

The Tax Division is responsible for maintaining and making program changes to the System, ensuring that System data is accurate and complete and collecting unpaid fines. As of December 15, 2000 more than \$7.6 million in fines and penalties were outstanding, of which more than 90% were between three months and five years old. Various tests of the collection of fines and penalties and reviews of System data and related operations disclosed the following:



1. Efforts by Tax to collect outstanding fines and penalties were not adequate.
  - a. On a historical basis, Tax has not collected about 50% of the fines and penalties resulting from parking tickets issued annually. For instance, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1999 the value of parking ticket fines and penalties totaled about \$3.1 million of which only about \$1.2 million (38%) was collected; \$376,000 (12%) was written off due to early payment discounts, protests and errors, and \$1.5 million (50%) remains outstanding. We believe that the current collection rate can be substantially improved upon and a significant amount of annual outstanding balances could be collected with improved policies, procedures and controls. The Parking Administrator for the City of Stamford, CT indicated that they collect about 85% of parking ticket fines and penalties utilizing handheld computer technology and a third party administrator. Tax management agreed to take action to develop and implement a plan for collecting outstanding balances and improving the collection rate of parking ticket fines and penalties in the future.
  - b. Delinquency notices were not being sent to individuals based on a standard schedule, nor were they being sent frequently enough. We found that during the two calendar years ending December 31, 2000 delinquency notices were produced and sent only four times on January 26, 1999; May 4, 1999; March 31, 2000; and December 13, 2000. Tax management indicated that delinquency notices were not being produced and mailed on a regular basis due to a lack of personnel and a number of other higher priority issues including updating the Tax and Parking Ticket Systems for Y2k compliance; purchasing and installing new System hardware; and, dealing with implementation and integration issues relating to the new Assessor System. Tax management agreed to develop and implement a standard schedule for the issuance of delinquency notices and ensure that they be produced and sent out at least on a quarterly basis if not more frequently.
  - c. Tax was not using all methods available to collect outstanding balances due from scofflaws. As previously noted at the time of our review there were 4,009 scofflaws with 32,985 outstanding tickets totaling more than \$1.9 million. We found that Tax was not notifying the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) of scofflaw violators so that vehicle registrations could be denied until all outstanding parking fines due the City are paid. Although Tax sends an electronic report of individuals who fail to pay property taxes on their vehicles to the DMV, this has never been done for scofflaws. We believe that a significant amount of outstanding fines and penalties relating to scofflaws could be collected if Tax reported scofflaws to the DMV. Tax management indicated that they were not reporting scofflaw information to the DMV because of technical incompatibility issues relating to the bulk transfer of data between the City's and DMV's Systems. Although we confirmed that a compatibility issue has existed for the last two years we also found that a workaround or solution to the problem is and has been available. Tax management agreed to take immediate action to report scofflaws to the DMV and develop and implement policies and procedures for periodically (monthly or quarterly) reporting scofflaws to the DMV to improve the collection of outstanding fines due to the City of Hartford.
  - d. Because of outdated or missing owner names and addresses for a significant number of vehicles in the Parking Ticket System collection efforts by Tax were not effective. We found that delinquency notices had not been sent to vehicle owners with more than 38,000 tickets with outstanding balances totaling more than \$2 million because their names and addresses were not recorded in the System. In addition, Tax was not regularly taking advantage of a service available from the DMV that provides owner names and addresses based on vehicle registrations. We also noted that many delinquency notices issued by Tax are returned unopened because the vehicle owners had moved and addresses in the System were incorrect. The last time Tax obtained names and an address from the DMV was in June 1999. Based on historical data, we believe that more than \$600,000 of the \$2 million noted above and amounts associated with incorrect addresses could have been collected if Tax had regularly utilized the service available from the DMV. In addition, the costs

associated with producing and mailing delinquency notices with incorrect addresses could be substantially reduced. As previously noted in item 1c above Tax management indicated that they were not obtaining this information from the DMV because of technical incompatibility issues relating to the bulk transfer of data between the City's and DMV's Systems. Although we confirmed that a compatibility issue has existed for the last two years we also found that a workaround or solution to the problem is and has been available. Tax management agreed to take immediate action to obtain up-to-date vehicle owner names and addresses from DMV and develop and implement policies and procedures for periodically obtaining this information from the DMV. Ideally, this should be coordinated with and take place before each scheduled delinquency notice run. DMV charges a nominal cost to provide this service.

- e. Cashiers do not check the System for additional outstanding tickets when vehicle owners come into the Tax office to pay a fine. Consequently, an individual paying the fine on a recently received ticket is not being notified that they have additional tickets and fines outstanding that also require payment. We recommended that cashiers check for other outstanding fines when receiving payments from vehicle owners, however, Tax management indicated that it is too time-consuming for Tax employees to perform this task and that collecting and recording Tax payments are of a higher priority.
  - f. Up to and including the fiscal year ended June 30, 1998 Tax was routinely writing off rather than collecting outstanding fines and penalties that were more than two years old. We found that during the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1998 Tax wrote off 136,714 tickets with a value of approximately \$7.6 million dollars. In general, Tax was writing off more fines and penalties each year than they were collecting. Apparently, Tax management was basing these write-offs on prior practices and an opinion from Corporation Counsel that was not documented in writing. Tax management agreed to ensure that the reason for and management approval of all future write-offs of fines and penalties are properly documented in the future.
2. Contrary to good internal control Tax cashiers who receive cash and checks for the payment of fines also have the ability to make adjustments to amounts due in the System. We also noted that cashiers can backdate the ticket payment date which effectively either eliminates existing fines and penalties or prevents the System from charging them. Consequently, it is possible for a cashier to reduce penalties due by backdating payment dates and receive and divert payments and subsequently adjust balances due off the System. The ability to receive and divert payments is largely confined to checks sent directly to the Tax office through the mail or checks and related payment information rejected by from lock box processing. Tax management agreed to take action to segregate responsibilities and System access capabilities so that cashiers and others who have access to cash and checks do not have the access and capability to make adjustments to amounts due in the System. In addition, Tax management agreed to take action to investigate and determine the feasibility of eliminating the exposures relating to the ability to backdate ticket payment dates.
  3. The System has a standardized report of credit balances. This report is a summary of tickets where payments and adjustments exceeded the amount of the fines and penalties. As of November 21, 2000 there were 4,467 tickets with credit balances totaling about \$103,000. One credit balance was on a ticket dated October 27, 1988. We reviewed 13 of these credit balances totaling \$206 and found that five totaling \$102 appeared to have resulted from apparent overpayments and eight totaling \$104 appeared to have resulted from adjustment errors. We found that there are no procedures for periodically reviewing, following up on and clearing these balances. Tax management agreed to develop and implement policies, procedures and controls to ensure that credit balances are periodically reviewed, followed up on and cleared in the future. In addition, Tax management agreed to take action to reduce or eliminate future credit balances through either a System enhancement that detects and/or prevents credits or by additional staff training.
  4. System management reporting capabilities were not adequate. The System has a limited number of standard management reports; however, they were not being produced and reviewed on a regular basis and did not provide enough information for management to effectively and efficiently

execute their responsibilities. As previously noted a report detailing the number and dollar value of excused and reduced fines was not available. We also noted that certain reports contained data that did not appear to make any sense or have any relevant value. Tax management reiterated that the System and related reports were never fully developed to their specifications or accepted and approved for implementation. Tax management agreed to determine the feasibility of developing effective management reports and related procedures for regularly reviewing and following up on noted issues and exceptions such as negative balances as deemed necessary.

5. The System will triple a fine only if it continues to be unpaid 14 days after a delinquency notice has been issued. Consequently, fines are not being tripled as required on registration numbers and related tickets in the System without vehicle owners' name and addresses. In addition, because delinquency notices are only being issued every six to 10 months penalties are not being assessed in a timely manner. This can cause penalties to be understated in the System and consequently underpaid by parking violators. As previously noted Tax management agreed to obtain vehicle owner names and addresses from the DMV and produce and mail delinquency notices on a more frequent basis and on a standard schedule.
6. Payments, a vast majority of which are personal checks, sent directly to the Tax office through the mail or rejected from the lock box are not always being processed and recorded in the System in a timely manner. In many instances this requires that payment dates be backdated so as to prevent the System from charging fines and penalties when inappropriate. In addition, these payments are not being deposited in a timely manner. Tax management indicated that these payments are not being processed in a timely manner because of the higher priority of processing and recording tax payments. Tax management agreed to take action to ensure that all payments received are processed, recorded in the System and deposited in a timely manner.
7. In general policies, procedures and controls were not adequate to ensure that all cash and checks received are properly recorded in the System and subsequently deposited to the appropriate City bank account. In addition to the previously noted issues regarding segregation of duties and System controls we also found that there is no procedure for regularly reconciling payments recorded in the System to cash register receipts and subsequent deposits. Overall, we believe that there is a potential exposure to the misappropriation of cash and checks paid for parking ticket fines and penalties. Tax management agreed to take action to develop policies, procedures and controls to ensure that all cash and checks received are properly accounted for, recorded in the System and deposited to the appropriate City bank account. Tax management indicated that this may be difficult due to the constraints and limitations of the existing System.
8. After a ticket is issued, HPD data entry personnel record related information in the System. When a ticket is subsequently paid, the payment information is entered to the System and matched with the issue data. Generally the paid and issue data match and the ticket is closed. In certain instances, ticket payments are made and recorded in the System prior to the issue data for the ticket being recorded in the System. This creates an unmatched record. We noted that there was no report detailing transactions with payment but no issue data nor were there policies, procedures and controls for identifying, investigating and clearing these items from the System. With the assistance of Tax we created a special report of payments made without related issue data. This report indicated that there were more than 13,000 unmatched payment transactions totaling about \$305,000. More than 4,000 or 30% of the transactions were from one to five years old. We believe that a majority of the older transactions resulted from lost or unaccounted for tickets where issue data was never recorded in the System. More likely than not a majority of the more recent transactions resulted from the untimely recording of ticket issue data in the System due to backlogs at HPD data entry. Tax management agreed to either use our report or create their own to identify unmatched transactions detailing payments without issue data. Tax management also agreed to develop policies, procedures and controls for following up on and clearing these transactions as required.

### **Protests and Hearings**

The Department of Public Works (DPW) is responsible for initial hearings for protested tickets and coordinating subsequent hearings with hearing officers as required. In addition, the DPW makes System adjustments to fines and penalties based on the results of ticket protest hearings. During the two fiscal



years ended June 30, 1999 adjustments totaling more than \$97,892 were made to ticket fines and penalties as a result of protests and hearings.

1. Although DPW had a documented procedure for “Municipal Citation Appeal Hearings”, policies and procedures for the parking ticket protest and hearing processes were not documented. Because an average of more than \$48,000 in fines and penalties are written off each year due to the protest and hearing processes it is important that standards and guidelines be developed and followed to ensure the propriety of the adjustments. DPW management agreed to develop and implement policies, procedures and controls for the parking ticket protest and hearing processes.
2. There were no procedures for reviewing; following up on and resolving protested tickets. Individuals who receive tickets may protest them by completing a “Parking Citation Objection Statement”. When the System is updated with a protest action it will not apply the standard penalties associated with an unpaid ticket nor will it produce delinquency notices until a hearing takes place and a protest determination is made and recorded in the System. We noted, however, that in many instances determinations are not made because there are no procedures and controls to ensure that hearings take place. We found that more than 260 tickets were under protest at the time of our review some of which were more than three years old. DPW management agreed to develop and implement policies, procedures and controls to ensure that protested tickets are reviewed and addressed in a timely manner in the future.
3. The protest form (Parking Citation Objection Statement) does not clearly identify the fines, penalties and adjustments. In addition, the form does not have a space for the hearing officer to sign. Although it appears that hearing officers initialed forms in certain instances, it was not always clear who made the determination and completed the form. DPW management agreed to review and enhance the parking ticket protest form so that ticket fines, penalties and adjustments are clearly identified and a space is provided for the signature of the hearing officer making the determination.
4. Adjustments are not always made as a result of the protest and hearing process. We noted that in certain instances Tax employees will adjust or write-off a ticket balance if an individual indicates that they were not in town at the time or an error was made regarding the make, color or type of vehicle. We recommended that all complaints be handled through and adjustments made as a result of the protest and hearing process. DPW management agreed to work with Tax management to centralize the hearing and adjustment processes.
5. Hearing officers do not always have a violator’s parking ticket history when conducting a hearing. We do not believe that an informed determination can be made by a hearing officer as to the reasonableness of a protested ticket without all available data. DPW management agreed to ensure that hearing officers obtain and review the ticket histories of violators prior to conducting protest hearings.
6. The System does not have the ability to provide adequate management information regarding protests, hearings and adjustments. There is no comprehensive listing identifying and summarizing all adjustments by type, dollar value and the users who made them. In addition, there is no report summarizing the number of protested tickets that are pending, when the protests were made and whether the ticket is in the initial hearing process or re-determination. DPW and Tax management agreed to take action to develop and implement System reports that provide adequate management information regarding protests, hearings and adjustments.

## Summary

As noted in the preceding details, policies, procedures and controls over all aspects of the parking ticket process needed improvement. Considering the magnitude of the problems identified we feel that steps must be taken immediately to ensure that the process is improved as required. Some of the steps we recommend for consideration are as follows:

1. Consideration should be given to outsourcing all or parts of the process.

2. If not outsourced, the various functions should be consolidated to the greatest extent possible into one operation under one manager. It may be beneficial to have these functions under the responsibility of the newly formed Parking Authority.
3. The current System should be replaced with a more state-of-the-art System and include handheld computers for issuing and recording tickets.

### OTHER MATTERS

No exceptions or only minor exceptions were noted for other areas reviewed but not included in this report.

Internal Audit  
City of Hartford

**For Informational Purposes Only for HPA RFP #090105  
Not for Distribution**

**Parking System Management Evaluation-Parking Meter Program  
City of Hartford, Downtown Study  
Desman Associates July 1998**

### **8.3 Existing Parking Meter Program**

*(Please note that some changes have occurred with regards to the City's meter program and that this information is meant to provide a background of the City's meter program history only)*

Within the City of Hartford, an average of 1,718 parking meters was in operation during fiscal year 1996-97 of which 888 were located within the study area. The balance of the parking meters was located in close proximity to the study area or in surface lots. There appear to be three different time limits used on downtown Hartford's parking meters. There are six 15-minute parking meters on Spruce Street, which serve parkers who are dropping off or picking up passengers from the bus and railroad stations. Another 1,585 parking meters have two-hour time limits and are located in the downtown area. Several streets have eight-hour meters where there is little demand for short term parking; there are 127 parking meters with eight-hour time limits located within the study area. The only blocks that do not have parking meters, need the curb lanes for traffic flow, are in locations of low parking demand, or are very narrow streets.

Three different types of parking meters are currently in Hartford's inventory. There are 417 Rhodes parking meters, which are very old and in need of replacement. Approximately 1,202 are P.O.M. Inc. (manufacturer) manual mechanical meters and approximately 99 P.O.M. Inc. electronic meters. The electronic parking meters represent state-of-the-art for single space parking meter technology.

Most parking meters in the city provide 20 minutes of parking for \$.25 for an equivalent rate of \$.75 per hour. The only exceptions are the eight hour meters that provides one hour parking for \$.25. Like parking meters in most cities, these rates are lower than rates charged in nearby off-street parking facilities. For example the City-owned Church Street Garage charges \$.55 per 30 minutes for the first two hours and \$1.10 per 30 minutes after two hours. In the City-owned MAT Garage, transient rates are \$1.75 per hour while the G. Fox Garage charges \$1.60 for each 30 minutes of parking. *(The G. Fox Garage is now the site of the Morgan Street Garage)*

Parkers are required to use parking meters from 8:00 A.M. until 6 P.M. only on weekday (except holidays), on most streets. A number of blocks have morning and/or afternoon peak hour restrictions. The morning peak hour restriction ends at 9 A.M. while the afternoon restriction begins at 3:30 P.M.

City Transportation Department personnel, who are responsible for the operation of the parking meter program, consist of a hearing officer and two parking meter field employees. The hearing officer supervises the staff and responds to parkers who appeal their parking citations. Field personnel are responsible for the maintenance and installation of all parking meters, in addition to the collection of revenue from all meters.

Since Rhodes meters are quite old, they require more labor and parts related expense to keep them in operating condition, than do the newer P.O.M. Inc. meters. However, the City's limited spare parts budget creates problems when it is necessary to provide spare parts for three different types of meters, and reportedly, no funds are available to purchase replacement parking meters.

With an estimated 35 parking meters vandalized annually, eventually enough meters will not exist to sustain the on-street System. In the past, the City included a budget for meter replacement. However, over the last three years, this line item has been eliminated. Furthermore, only a small number of meters have been purchased when budget surplus became available.

Two parking meter field employees are currently handling parking meter revenue collection and coin

sorting. Collection routes have been established for the downtown area where field employees collect meter revenue every fourth business day, while outlying routes are collected only once a month. A sealed coin box collection System is used in all P.O.M. Inc. parking meters. Both field employees and either their supervisor or another Transportation Department employee is present to observe the coin sorting and counting operation.

During the past several years, parking meter revenues have ranged from a high of \$508 per meter during FY1991-92, to a low of \$435 per meter in FY 1993-1994. A significant decline in parking meter revenue occurred between FY 1992-1993 and FY 1993-1994, when meter revenues went from an average of \$497 to \$435 per meter, resulting in a decline in total meter revenue of more than \$200,000. Part of this decline occurred as a result of the number of parking meters being reduced from 2,086 to 1,877. The \$62 per year reduction in unit meter revenue however was the major cause of this reduction in revenue.

The number of citations issued by the parking controllers has been declining over the past several years. The following table summarizes the production level of the parking controllers:

Fiscal Year	Number of Parking Controller Citations Issued	Average Number of Parking Citations Issued by Day**	Average Number of Parking Citations Issued Daily by each Controller
1995-96	40,908	170.45	28.4
1996-97	35,067	146.09	24.3
1997-98*	25,173	139.85	23.3

\* First nine months of fiscal year

\*\* Assumes an average of 240 days per year that each controller is working

As shown, the daily productivity level for the parking controllers has declined from approximately 28 to 23 citations. In typical urban areas like Downtown Hartford, parking controllers generally issue an average of 60 to 80 citations in a day.

Annual parking meter revenue totaled \$788,789 during fiscal year 1996-97. Based on 254 weekdays of operation, each meter earned approximately \$459.13 per month or \$1.81 per day. Accordingly, with the majority of parking meters having a rate of \$.75 per hour, and after taking into account the small number of eight hour meters at a rate of \$.25 per hour, the amount of revenue collected from each meter could lead one to conclude that the average on-street metered parking spaces is only being used between two and three hours per day. Observation by this consultant indicates, however, that occupancy levels are much higher. On part, as discussed in more detail below, more than 90 percent of the meters in the study area appeared to be occupied during the peak period on a typical weekday. Although it is likely that parking meters located in outlying areas generate lower levels of usage, the above observations indicate that the City is realizing far less revenue that it could from its on-street metered parking.

**APPENDIX B****PROPOSER EXPERIENCE MATRIX**

<b>EXPERIENCE</b>	<i>5 years or more in three cities or more</i>	<i>5 years or more in less than three cities</i>	<i>2 or 3 years in three cities or more</i>	<i>2 or 3 years in less than three cities</i>	<i>1 year or less in three cities or more</i>	<i>1 year or less in less than three cities</i>	<i>No experience</i>
<b>1.Violations Processing Experience</b>							
<b>2.On Street Parking Consulting</b>							
<b>3. Meter, Boot/tow, and permit parking systems</b>							
<b>4. Telephone IVR and Internet payment services</b>							
<b>5. DMV interface and vehicle ownership processing in CT</b>							
<b>6. DMV interface and vehicle ownership processing in relevant states (NY, MA, RI, VT, NH, NJ, FL, and PA)</b>							

For each of the six categories please list the cities and associated years of experience that your firm has worked in below

1. Violations Processing:
2. On Street Parking Consulting:
3. Meter, boot/tow, permit systems:
4. Telephone and Internet Payment services:
5. DMV processing experience – CT DMV only:
6. DMV processing experience – relevant DMVs:

**APPENDIX C****COMPLIANCE MATRIX**

	Yes, service and products fully comply	Service and products partially comply – customizations/modifications possible to fully comply - no additional cost	Modifications to service and products required to comply - no additional cost	Service and products partially comply – modifications possible to fully comply at additional cost	Modifications to service and products required to comply at additional cost	Service and products partially comply – modifications not possible	No, service and products does not comply – modifications not possible
4.2 PCMIS System							
4.4 Reporting							
4.5.1 Hand Held Computers							
4.5.2. Enforcement							
4.5.3 Processing							
4.5.4. Noticing							
4.5.5 DMV Interface							
4.5.6 Appeals/ Hearing							
4.6. Meter Management							
4.7. Regulated Sign Management							
4.8. Permit Management and RPP							

4.9. Booting and Towing							
4.10. Special License Plates							
4.11. On Street Parking Consulting							
4.12. Customer Service							
5.1 System Performance							
5.2 System Security							

**SCHEDULE A****COMPENSATION BID FORM***For providing services related to a***COMPREHENSIVE AND INTEGRATED ON-STREET PARKING  
AND CITATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM**

The Parking Management Firm requests the following levels of compensation for the Services outlined in the attached specification document:

**Year 1**

1 Base Management Fee				\$	
2 Salary and wages per hour paid to the SP for 8 fully trained and equipped Parking Violations Officers	Total Annual Hours	Per Hour	Per Year		
	16320	\$	\$		
3 Actual salary and wages per hour paid to Parking Violations Officers*	16320			\$	\$
<b>Total Items 1 &amp; 2 (do not include # 3)</b>				\$	
4 Percent of dollars collected from parking violations to be paid to the SP					%

\* Shall comply with and is subject to the City of Harford Living Wage Ordinance

**Year 2**

1 Base Management Fee				\$	
2 Salary and wages per hour paid to the SP for 8 fully trained and equipped Parking Violations Officers	Total Annual Hours	Per Hour	Per Year		
	16320	\$	\$		
3 Actual salary and wages per hour paid to Parking Violations Officers*	16320			\$	\$
<b>Total Items 1 &amp; 2 (do not include # 3)</b>				\$	
4 Percent of dollars collected from parking violations to be paid to the SP					%

\* Shall comply with and is subject to the City of Harford Living Wage Ordinance



**Year 3**

1 Base Management Fee				\$
2 Salary and wages per hour paid to the SP for 8 fully trained and equipped Parking Violations Officers	Total Annual Hours	Per Hour	Per Year	
	16320	\$	\$	
3 Actual salary and wages per hour paid to Parking Violations Officers*	16320			
		\$	\$	
<b>Total Items 1 &amp; 2 (do not include # 3)</b>				\$
4 Percent of dollars collected from parking violations to be paid to the SP				%

\* Shall comply with and is subject to the City of Harford Living Wage Ordinance

**Year 4**

1 Base Management Fee				\$
2 Salary and wages per hour paid to the SP for 8 fully trained and equipped Parking Violations Officers	Total Annual Hours	Per Hour	Per Year	
	16320	\$	\$	
3 Actual salary and wages per hour paid to Parking Violations Officers*	16320			
		\$	\$	
<b>Total Items 1 &amp; 2 (do not include # 3)</b>				\$
4 Percent of dollars collected from parking violations to be paid to the SP				%

\* Shall comply with and is subject to the City of Harford Living Wage Ordinance

**Year 5**

1 Base Management Fee				\$
2 Salary and wages per hour paid to the SP for 8 fully trained and equipped Parking Violations Officers	Total Annual Hours	Per Hour	Per Year	
	16320	\$	\$	
3 Actual salary and wages per hour paid to Parking Violations Officers*	16320			
		\$	\$	
<b>Total Items 1 &amp; 2 (do not include # 3)</b>				\$
4 Percent of dollars collected from parking violations to be paid to the SP				%

\* Shall comply with and is subject to the City of Harford Living Wage Ordinance

## ***Certification***

The Manager named below, and attested to by its authorized representative, hereby certify that full compliance with the provisions of this Request for Proposals and its related Specifications and other Contract Documents shall be provided for the compensation contained in the figures listed in this Schedule A.

Manager's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_